DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 413 HE 015 731

AUTHOR Douglas, Joel M., Ed.
TITLE Faculty Work Stoppages in Higher Education: 1966-1982.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Bernard Baruch Coll. National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 11p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10010.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT Newsletter; v10 n4 Oct 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Economic Factors; Employment Problems; Faculty College Relationship; Government Employees; *Higher Education; *Labor Relations; Negotiation Impasses; State Colleges; *Teacher Strikes; Trend Analysis; *Unions

ABSTRACT

A theory of strikes in higher education and a statistical analysis of strike activity are presented in this newsletter issue. The report on the theory of strikes in an article by Lisa Flanzraich addresses the absence of strikes on campuses during fall 1982 and the conditions in which strikes occur. The absence of strikes could be proof of the maturation of collective bargaining in higher education, or indicative of the economic recessions of the past decade. Advocates of striking maintain that the right to strike is an integral part of the collective bargaining process. Reasons most often cited in support of the strike prohibition for public employees include the following: the government is the employer and is immune from strikes, and the employer is not profit oriented. Although public employees do not enjoy the right to strike, the majority of faculty strikes have been in public institutions. A factor to consider in analyzing why strikes do not happen is the multi-year contract. A complete listing of all reported faculty strikes in higher education prepared by Esther Liebert is presented. The 92 faculty work stoppages reported in higher education collective bargaining from 1966-1982 are identified by year, institution, state, agent, whether the institution is two- or four-year and duration of the strike. The mean and median length of strikes in calendar days and an outline of work stoppages by bargaining agents are provided. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224413

NEWSLETTER - National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions

Published at Baruch College . City University of New York . Vol. 10, No. 4

October 1982

FACULTY WORK STOPPAGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1966-1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCSCBHEP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 015 731

NEWSLETTER

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE PROFESSIONS

Published at Baruch College • City University of New York • Vol. 10, No. 4 • October 1982.

FACULTY WORK STOPPAGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1966-1982

Editor's Note: Where are the 1982 strikes? Each year the Center prepares a special analysis of the fall semester "back-to-school strikes" in higher education. This year, as we have done for the past ten years, we have undertaken a national survey to ascertain the extent of strike activity in academic collective bargaining. To our surprise, the results of our survey indicated that not one bargaining agent was on strike in September 1982. Given this fact, we asked representatives of both labor and management for their explanations as to why this was so. While no one reason was widely accepted, most of the explanations centered around prevailing economic conditions and declining enrollment.

Strikes in a period of recession assume their own characteristics; the ease of worker substitution, lack of job alternatives and a hostile consumer. These factors, along with a reminder of the PATCO syndrome account in part, for this lack of strike activity. We at the Center also see some positive factors accounting for this phenomenon. Included is the maturing of the collective bargaining relationship, the increase of multi-year agreements, and the creative use of labor-management relations committees to enhance articulation. Other reasons, not necessarily of a positive nature, include the aftermath of *Yeshiva* and the concerted drive of the three national unions for representation rights at California State University.

This special strike issue contains a report by Lisa Flanzraich, the Librarian of the National Center, on the theory of strikes in higher education, as well as a complete listing of all reported faculty strikes in higher education prepared by Esther Liebert, Assistant Administrator for Employee and Labor Relations at Baruch College and a member of the Center's Faculty Advisory Committee. The tables corresponding to the strike data were prepared by Lorraine DeBona, a researcher with the Center.

While the Center strives for complete accuracy, we acknowledge that the tabulation of strike data is often incomplete at best, therefore, we apologize for any errors or omissions.

PART I - A THEORY OF STRIKES
by Lisa Flanzraich

The absence of strikes on campus this fall denotes a significant development in academic labor relations. Not since 1970 has there been such a complete lack of strike activity among college faculty. While labor history, especially among public school teachers, has been dramatized and pictorialized by demonstrators on the picket line, striking has not been a typical modus operandi among the professoriate. Compared with public school teachers, who struck at the rate of 130 per year in the first half of the 1970's, there were a total of 91 strikes in higher education from 1966-1981.[1] In the 1979-80 academic year, there were 242 teacher strikes on the elementary and secondary levels as compared with 11 faculty strikes.[2]

The strike is an anomaly in the history of academic collective bargaining. Theoretically, if the strike is the sanction that makes collective bargaining viable, then the test case of faculty bargaining in the past decade is the exception which proves the rule.[3] Predictions of increased strike activity as faculties unionize have not materialized. This could be proof of the maturation of collective bargaining in higher education, or indicative of the economic recessions of the past decade.

Strikes occur "where there is greater generalized faculty discontent in respect to salary, benefits, working conditions and a degree of participation in decision making."[4] A "perceived failure of the bargaining process to resolve faculty concerns" can aggravate this weapon.[5] It has also been postulated that faculty will strike when "confronted with issues of major importance to their working lives."[6] Because there is a dearth of strikes in the academic world, the obvious conclusion is that faculties are not compelled to strike. They have achieved total job satisfaction, live harmoniously with administration and trustees, are paid well, and enjoy security and tenure. The validity of this equation is, of course, open to debate.

Striking is a source of controversy within the academic community. Opponents of the strike weapon hold that it is incongruent with the academic community because it violates the principles of collegiality and governance. Ironically, strikes have erupted over these two sacred cows. Striking is inconsistent with the intellectual method of rational discourse so characteristic of the profession itself and is a radical and extreme action.

Although the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has been theoretically opposed to the use of the strike weapon, it has supported 23 strikes since the advent of campus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Faculty Work Stoppages in Higher Education: 1966-1982 1
Part I–A Theory of Strikes 1
Part II–Statistical Analysis of Strike Data 3
From the Bookshelf 7
1982-83 Center Programs 8

bargaining (See Table No. Three). Exceptions are made for the dramatic impact of a strike, especially if there are wide gaps in salaries and workloads and when there are violations of academic freedom and tenure.[7] The AAUP censures administrations which circumvent faculty rights and urges members to not accept appointments at these institutions.

Still, the AAUP has maintained that striking damages the collegial bond between administration and faculty, demarcating the line between employer and employee. Thus, the strike should never be used as a routine method as it is in the industrial sector. The strike causes a change in emphasis from the academic image of pedagogue to haggling mercenary, illustrating that professors are more concerned with their pocketbooks than professionalism or teaching.

Absent a "no-strike provision" at private institutions, faculty are legally entitled to strike, while their public counterparts are not. Strikes in the public sector have been barred for several traditional, if not antiquated, arguments. Among the reasons most often cited in support of the strike prohibition are:

- the government is also the employer and as sovereign is immune from strikes
- the employer is not profit oriented
- no competitive market pricing structure exists for public services
- the public is held as hostage
- the public is inconvenienced and subjected to danger
- the strike is a method of gaining political power by economic sanction[8]

Advocates of striking maintain that the right to strike is an integral part of the collective bargaining process, and that bargaining is a perfunctory exercise without the union's ability to withhold the production of goods or services. Public employees are entitled to the same bargaining rights as their private industry counterparts to improve working conditions. Striking traditionally demonstrates the clout and ability of a union to negotiate with management on an egalitarian basis; without it, there is no incentive on the part of management to negotiate in good faith or on a serious level.

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) endorses and supports the professors' right to strike. Their position, espoused by Albert Shanker, President of the AFT, is that a union needs to demonstrate its power by striking. If public school teachers "do not in fact exercise the rights to strike, the government may never create the machinery that employees have in other states. It is not accidental that in states in which public employees have engaged in strikes the legislatures have found it possible to create mechanisms for collective bargaining."[9]

Although public employees do not enjoy the right to strike, the majority of faculty strikes have been in public institutions. Sixty-six of the 92 strikes from 1966-1982 were in public institutions, and 52 were at public community colleges, demonstrating that the legality or illegality of striking does not prevent strikes.[10] Although several states have punitive administrative laws, it has not always been practical to enforce sanctions after a settlement is reached. Administrators at public colleges cannot "lock out," but have access to injunctive relief as a means of ending a strike.

Since higher education is not classified as an essential service, it has also been argued that striking should be permitted after third-party intervention methods have been exhausted. A limited right-to-strike has been won for public employees in Alaska, Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, Oregon and Vermont. It has been recognized that the withholding of educational services does not constitute a destructive or life-endangering action, and that the general public is neither inconvenienced nor involved. Ironically, this same argument, which points to the "nonessential" nature of higher education, can be used to point out the ineffectiveness of the strike weapon itself.

In their seminal work, *Unions on Campus*, Kemerer and Baldridge assert that strikes in higher education are ineffective and that the only group who suffers damage is the professoriate itself. The institution may benefit by saving salaries, although they also run the risk of losing tuition and enrollments.[11] Carr, in *Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus*, points out that strikes cause further alienation between faculty and governing boards. Although the gains won by public school teacher strikes may be proof of the usefulness of strike action, Carr cautions against this application to higher education. His analysis of the strike at St. John's University in 1966 suggests that AAUP censure was more instrumental in reinstating faculty than the AFT-backed strike. The militant faculty-student strike at San Francisco State University in 1969 failed, in Carr's estimation, because faculty did not achieve economic or decision-making gains.[12]

Although the strike weapon is sometimes employed to cause political embarrassment to management, the unions also run the risk of encountering hostile public reaction, thus counteracting the goal of political support. Public reaction may not be favorable to a professional class who has already achieved social status as well as a decent paycheck. There is little evidence to prove that politicians will support unions and interfere with higher education administrators.[13] This is true for both public and private institutions.

The effectiveness of the strike weapon in acquiring better benefits or working conditions needs further research and analysis, especially in relation to decision making. Duryea and Fisk maintain that "the strike does not proffer itself as a viable weapon for the academic unions. Academic unions lack a tradition in their constituency and the logistical support of organization and funds to carry through with several months of enforced unemployment without pay within institutions that simply do not face a parallel loss of income and need but wait for support from students and parents fearful of the loss of an education for themselves and their offspring."[14]

NATIONAL CENTER NEWSLETTER

A publication of the National Center issued five times during the year. Annual subscription rate: $20; single copy, $4.00; free to Center members. Back issues available.

Editor and Director of the Center: Joel M. Douglas

Executive Assistant to the Director: Evan G. Mitchell

Administrative Assistant: Ruby N. Hill

Librarian: Lisa Flanzraich

Research Assistants: Lorraine DeBona
Carol Rosenberg

Address inquiries and contributions to the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010. Telephone: (212) 725-3390.

Since the strike is uncommon in higher education, other procedures supplemental to the bargaining process have been adapted. These include lobbying, political action, faculty support, mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration. Going public by enlisting the help of an intervenor has traditionally been repugnant to both labor and management because it reduces their autonomy. Issues often are distorted when public disdain or sympathy is part of the picture. Lobbying the legislature for increased benefits is an alternative option.

The substantial changes that colleges and universities have weathered in the past decade have, no doubt, affected the frequency of strikes. Job opportunities have vanished, retrenchment is a household word, and the financial support systems of government, foundations, and research grants have evaporated. A grim mood embraces the profession and a tendency to maintain the status quo could be a factor in the lack of strike activity. Most likely, the profession as a whole cannot imagine itself on the picket line.

The public has reached a saturation point with strikes, especially within the public sector. Its attitude has been influenced by the PATCO strike of last year. It holds that the excessive demands of unions are partly to blame for the current economic crisis because they are always demanding higher wages.

Other factors to consider in analyzing why strikes do not happen are the multi-year contract, which has a stabilizing effect on college labor relations, and a perceived sophistication and skill in negotiating on both sides of the table. Experts in the field, such as William E. Simkin, have commented that strikes are unnecessary when the negotiators are sharp enough to identify the "settlement area" between the two parties.[15] Strikes have come to be viewed as obsolete; their validity and effectiveness have been under scrutiny by labor relations specialists who have stated that "to suggest that we cannot have collective bargaining without reliance directly on the strike as the moving force is the same as saying that in international relations we cannot have diplomacy if we renounce warfare."[16]

Experience suggests that work stoppages do not appear to be the bargaining vehicle for faculty unions that it is in the industrial sector. Some have suggested that strikes have become inefficient and are in reality an unsophisticated bargaining ploy. Longitudinal studies on campuses that have experienced strikes are needed to ascertain the long-range problem associated with them.

FOOTNOTES

1. David L. Colton and Edith E. Graber, *Teacher Strikes and the Courts* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1982), p. 1.; Esther Liebert, "Government Adjustment of Labor Disputes in Higher Education" (Baruch College, n.d.), p. 27.

2. Colton, *Teacher Strikes and the Courts*, p. 1.; "1981 Strike Scene," *Newsletter, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions* 9 (September-October 1981), p. 7.

3. Robert K. Carr and Daniel K. Van Eyck, *Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973), pp. 169-170.

4. James P. Begin, Theodore Settle, and Paula Alexander, *Academics on Strike* (New Brunswick, NJ: Institute of Management and Labor Relations, 1975), p. 3.

5. *Ibid.* p. 5.

6. *Ibid.* p. 132.

7. Carr, *Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus*, p. 179; *Policy Documents and Reports* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1977), p. 59.

8. Anthony M. Cresswell and Michael J. Murphy, *Education and Collective Bargaining: Readings in Policy and Research* (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 301.

9. Albert L. Shanker, "Why Teachers Need the Right to Strike," in *Education and Collective Bargaining: Readings in Policy and Research*, Anthony M. Cresswell and Michael J. Murphy (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 359.

10. Liebert, "Government Adjustments of Labor Disputes in Higher Education," p. 27.

11. Frank R. Kemerer and J. Victor Baldridge, *Unions on Campus* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975), p. 104.

12. Carr, *Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus*, pp. 180-182.

13. E. D. Duryea and Robert S. Fisk, *Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), pp. 25-26.

14. *Ibid.* p. 214.

15. William E. Simkin, *Mediation and the Dynamics of Collective Bargaining* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1971), pp. 159-161.

16. Walter E. Baer, *Strikes: A Study of Conflict and How to Avoid It* (New York: AMACOM, 1975), p. 198.

PART II - STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF STRIKE DATA

Ninety-two faculty work stoppages have been reported in higher education collective bargaining from 1966-1982. Of these, 66 (72%) were in the public sector, while the remaining 26 (28%) were in private institutions. Eighteen of the public sector strikes were classified as legal stoppages having occurred in the eight states which permit a limited right to strike. The legal status of private sector strikes is not discernible, since absent a statutory prohibition or a contract bar, private sector employees have an unqualified right to strike.

Fifty-three (58%) of the strikes identified in Table One occurred in two-year schools. Of these, only four (8%) were private. Almost all of the private sector strikes, 22, occurred in four-year institutions.

Michigan led the country in strike frequency with 19. Illinois with 16 and Pennsylvania with 15 were close behind. Strike activity in these three states is frequent in public employment and thus it is not unusual that the professoriate followed suit. These statistics do not take into account the proportion of colleges in each state and thus cannot be considered despositive.

The institutions with the greatest number of strikes were City Colleges of Chicago, with six, Community College of Philadelphia, Wayne State, and Long Island University (Brooklyn and C.W. Post) with three each.

The issue of impasse resolution and intervention in work stoppages is difficult to ascertain. No central collection of data concerning either executive, judicial or agency intervention exists,

nevertheless some form of third party intervention was identified in nearly half of all stoppages. Judicial involvement was the most frequently employed form of intervention, with injunctive relief the most commonly used process. Ten strikes were enjoined. Injunctive relief is often used to return faculty to the classroom while negotiations continue. In several stoppages, the judges served as third-party intervenors, however, this practice is not considered the most efficient in terms of impasse resolution.

Mediators were used in approximately one-third of the stoppages with federal mediation the most prevalent. In some instances, MED-ARB, in which the mediator is empowered to issue a binding arbitration award, was employed. Several of the strikes utilized more than one type of intervention, however, it appeared that mediators and fact finders were routinely assigned to work stoppages in higher education.

TABLE ONE
FACULTY WORK STOPPAGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1966-1982*

Year	Institution*	State	Agent*	2/4 Year	Duration*** (Cal. Days)
1966	Henry Ford Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	6
	*St. John's University	NY	UFCT/AFT	4	150
	City Colleges of Chicago	IL	AFT	2	3
1967	Lake Michigan Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	42
	*Catholic Univ. of America	DC	AFT	4	5
	Chicago City Colleges	IL	AFT	2	6[b]
1968	Northeastern Illinois Univ.	IL	AFT('77)**	4	14
	Chicago State Univ.	IL	AFT('77)**	4	19
1969	San Francisco State College	CA	AFT	4	51
	San Jose City College Distr.	CA	AFT	2	36
	Milwaukee Technical College	WI	AFT	2	42
	City Colleges of Chicago	IL	AFT	2	2
1971	Oakland University	MI	NEA	4	16
	Nassau Comm. College	NY	AFT	2	14
1972	Comm. College of Allegheny County	PA	AFT	2	31
	Comm. Coll. of Philadelphia	PA	AFT	2	49
1973	Lake Michigan College	MI	AFT	2	80
	Tacoma Comm. College	WA	AFT	2	12
	City Colleges of Chicago	IL	AFT	2	2
	*Antioch University	OH	NEA('80)**	4	42
	Westmoreland Comm. College	PA	NEA	2	90
	Wayne County Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	14
1974	Univ. of Alaska Comm. Colleges	AK	AFT	2	18
	Green River Comm. College	WA	AFT	2	10
	Lehigh County Comm. College	PA	NEA	2	15
	*Lincoln Technical Institute	PA	IND.	2	42
	Moraine Valley Comm. College	IL	AFT	2	22
	*Rider College	NJ	AAUP	4	8
	New Jersey State College System	NJ	AFT	4	10
	Wayne County Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	4
1975	Bucks County Comm. College	PA	AFT	2	9
	City Colleges of Chicago	IL	AFT	2	21
	Rhode Island Junior College	RI	NEA	2	5
	Thornton Comm. College	IL	AFT	2	10
	Univ. of Bridgeport	CT	AAUP	4	3
	College of Marin	CA	NEA('76)**	2	1
	*Robert Morris College	PA	AFT	4	7
1976	Comm. Coll. of Philadelphia	PA	AFT	2	32
	*Pepperdine Univ.-Seaver College	CA	IND.	4	1
	Univ. of Alaska Comm. Colleges	AK	AFT	2	7
	Oakland University	MI	AAUP	4	3
	*Adelphi University	NY	AAUP	4	1
	Wayne State University	MI	AAUP	4	23
	Comm. College of Beaver County	PA	NEA	2	30

TABLE ONE *continued*

Year	Institution*	State	Agent·	2/4 Year	Duration··· (Cal. Days)
1977	Western Michigan University	MI	AAUP	4	1
	*Wentworth Institute	MA	AFT	4	18
	Thornton Comm. College	IL	AFT	2	16
	Joliet Junior College	IL	AFT	2	8
	*Dowling College	NY	AAUP	4	14
	*Wagner College	NY	AAUP	4	21
	*Long Island Univ. (C.W. Post)	NY	AFT	4	20
	Univ. of Alaska Comm. Colleges	AK	AFT	2	[illegible]
	Connnecticut State Technical Colleges	CT	AFT	2	4
	*Stevens Institute of Technology	NJ	AAUP	4	18
	Bucks County Comm. College	PA	AFT	2	35
1978	City Colleges of Chicago	IL	AFT	2	25
	*Univ. of Bridgeport	CT	AAUP	4	16
	Ferris State College	MI	NEA	4	2
	Wayne State University	MI	AAUP	4	2
	Eastern Michigan Univer[illegible]	MI	AAUP	4	7
	Kellogg Comm. College	MI	NEA	2	3
	Henry Ford Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	7
	Lansing Comm. College	MI	AFT	2	7
	Schoolcraft College	MI	NEA	2	17
	Univ. of D.C.-Van Ness Campus	DC	NEA	4	3
1979	Delaware County Comm. College	PA	NEA	2	21
	*Fairleigh Dickenson Univ.	NJ	AAUP	2/4	10
	*Hofstra University	NY	AAUP	4	1
	*Long Island Univ. (Brooklyn College)	NY	AFT	4	24
	*Monmouth College	NJ	AAUP	4	13
	Rhode Island Junior College	RI	NEA	2	9
	*Union College	NJ	AAUP	2	10
	Univ. of Cincinnati	OH	AAUP	4	6
	Univ. of Rhode Island	RI	AAUP	4	14
	Washtenaw Comm. College	MI	NEA	2	10
	Prairie State College	IL	AFT	2	21
	*Boston University	MA	AAUP	4	7
1980	Belleville Area College	IL	AAUP	2	17
	*Univ. of Dubuque Theological Seminary	IA	NEA	4	3
	*Long Island Univ. (Brooklyn College)	NY	AFT	4	42
	McHenry County College	IL	NEA	4	6
	Nassau Comm. College	NY	AFT	2	8
	Schoolcraft College	MI	NEA	2	5
	*Union College	NJ	AAUP	2	12
	Wayne State University	MI	AAUP	4	23
1981	Delaware County Comm. College	PA	NEA	2	25
	*Dowling College	NY	AFT	4	14
	Montgomery County Comm. College	PA	AAUP	2	23
	*Univ. of Dubuque	IA	NEA	4	11
	*Wagner College	NY	AFT	4	21
	Comm. Coll. of Philadelphia	PA	AFT	2	4
1982	Prairie State College	IL	AFT	2	77

*Signifies private institution
·Agent at time of strike
··Agent at time of strike unknown. Agent listed is *current* agent; parentheses indicate year agent was elected.
···Duration of strikes are approximations.
·Denotes full-time faculty strikes
*2 walkouts–3 days each

Source: E. Liebert, "Government Adjustment of Labor Disputes in Higher Education" (unpublished paper, Baruch College) pp. 22-26.
NCSCBHEP Research

Table Two describes the mean and median length of strikes in calendar days. The mean for reported strikes was 18.4 days, with 12.5 days the median. The range, in terms of calendar days, was from 1 to 150. The 1982 statistics are skewed to the extent that only one reported strike, Prairie State College continued for 77 days. If we break down further the mean for the eight years prior to 1982, it is 13. The mean for the first eight years of this study is 33 days. It is clear that the length of strikes in terms of both mean and median has diminished.

TABLE TWO
FACULTY WORK STOPPAGES: 1966-1982[a]
FREQUENCY–MEAN & MEDIAN

YEAR	NUMBER OF STRIKES	MEAN LENGTH DAYS[b]	MEDIAN LENGTH DAYS
1966	3	53	6
1967	3	17.6	6
1968	2	16.5	16.5
1969	4	32.75	39
1970	0	0	0
1971	2	15	15
1972	2	40	40
1973	6	40	28
1974	8	16.3	12.5
1975	7	8	7
1976	7	13.7	7
1977	11	14.8	16
1978	10	8.9	7
1979	12	12.2	10
1980	8	14.5	10
1981	6	16.3	17.5
1982	1	77	77
Totals	92	18.4	12.5

[a]Denotes full-time faculty strikes
[b]Denotes calendar days

Source: NCSCBHEP Research

Table Three outlines faculty work stoppages by bargaining agents. AFT bargaining units were involved in 48 stoppages identified in this study. Additionally, 23 faculty units were certified as AAUP, 19 as NEA, with two classified as independents. The mean and median length of AFT strikes was substantially longer than those of either the AAUP or the NEA. Independent units have not struck in the past seven years, and, excluding Prairie State College, not one of the three major agents was involved in any strike activity at the outset of the fall 1982 semester.

TABLE THREE
FACULTY WORK STOPPAGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION BY AGENT: 1966-1982[a]

YEAR	NUMBER OF STRIKES	Length (Cal. Days) AAUP	MEAN	MEDIAN	Length (Cal. Days) AFT	MEAN	MEDIAN	Length (Cal. Days) NEA	MEAN	MEDIAN	Length (Cal. Days) IND	MEAN	MEDIAN
1966	3	0	0	0	3	53	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	3	0	0	0	3	17.6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	2	16.5	16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	4	0	0	0	4	32.75	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
1970	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	0	0	0	1	14	14	1	16	16	0	0	0
1972	2	0	0	0	2	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
1973	6	0	0	0	4	27	13	2	66	66	0	0	0
1974	8	1	8	8	5	12.8	10	1	15	15	1	42	42
1975	7	1	3	3	4	11.8	9.5	2	3	3	0	0	0
1976	7	3	9	3	2	19.5	19.5	1	30	30	1	1	1
1977	11	4	13.5	16	7	15.6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
1978	10	3	8	7	3	13	7	4	6.3	3	0	0	0
1979	12	7	8.7	10	2	22.5	22.5	3	13.3	10	0	0	0
1980	8	3	17.3	17	2	25	25	3	4.7	5	0	0	0
1981	6	1	23	23	3	13	14	2	18	18	0	0	0
1982	1	0	0	0	1	77	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	92	23	11	10	48	22.5	14	19	16.5	10	2	21.5	21.5

[a]Denotes full-time faculty strike

Source: NCSCBHEP Research

Table Four identifies the number of fall "back-to-school" faculty work stoppages. No break-down exists for strikes prior to 1977, however, since that time, the number of strikes in this category diminished. Back to school strikes are defined as those occurring at the outset of the fall semester and are designed to dramatize the demands of the union. No tabulations are available for stoppages by adjunct faculty, however, such strikes have been identified in New York, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island.

TABLE FOUR
STRIKE SUMMARY
"BACK TO SCHOOL STRIKES"–FALL SEMESTER 1977-82

FALL SEMESTER	NUMBER OF STRIKES
1977	6
1978	12
1979	11
1980	8
1981	4
1982	0

Source: NCSCBHEP Research

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

These latest acquisitions from our library are now available for circulation and reference to our members.

Chait, Richard P. and Andrew T. Ford. *Beyond Traditional Tenure: A Guide to Sound Policies and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982. 291 pp.
Based on interviews and surveys of faculty and administrators, the authors present the successes and failures of the tenure system and discuss the changing nature of it.

Coulson, Robert. *The Termination Handbook.* New York: Free Press, 1981. 232 pp.
Offers practical advice to both the employee and employer on termination.

Denker, Joel. *Unions and Universities: The Rise of the New Labor Leader.* Monclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, 1981. 160 pp.
Documents the rise of labor studies as an academic discipline and the emergence of the college-educated labor organizer.

Dressel, Paul L. *Administrative Leadership: Effective and Responsive Decision Making in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1981 243 pp.
As a consultant, the author analyzes the decision-making process in academia and shows why institutions reach impasse in resolving key issues.

Edwards, Harry T. and Virginia Davis Nordin. *Higher Education and The Law.* Cambridge, MA: Institute for Educational Management, Harvard University, 1979. 844 pp.
Describes how legislative decisions and regulation impact upon higher education.

Feldacker, Bruce S. *Labor Guide to Labor Law.* Reston, VA: Reston Publishing, 1980. 402 pp.
Survey and textbook to private sector labor law written from a labor perspective for labor relations students and unionists.

Fortunato, Ray T. and D. Geneva Waddell. *Personnel Administration in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981. 384 pp.
This personnel handbook shows administrators how to develop and implement policies and procedures, increase productivity, and deal with economic strain.

Hopkins, David S.P. and William F. Massey. *Planning Models for Colleges and Universities.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1981, 544 pp.
Written for college and university planners and administrators, this book shows how decision models can become a part of the planning process.

Johnstone, Ronald L. *The Scope of Faculty Collective Bargaining: An Analysis of Faculty Union Agreements at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981. 195 pp.
A content analysis comparing bargaining agreements at 89 four-year institutions, as of December 31, 1979.

Leslie, David W., et al. *Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education.* New York, Praeger, 1982. 151 pp.
Explores part-time faculty workforce. Identifies characteristics of it and studies its contractual relationship with the institution.

Mingle, James, ed. *Challenges of Retrenchment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981. 394 pp.
Describes and evaluates retrenchment at colleges and universities nationwide. Discusses how these institutions have anticipated and planned for declining enrollments, curricula, and personnel.

Riesman, David. *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980. 421 pp.
In contrast to the growth of faculties in the 1960's, Riesman emphasizes the impact of the student market. The "student as consumer" now influences personnel decisions, enrollments, federal regulation, and curriculum.

Seldin, Peter, *Successful Faculty Evaluation Programs.* Crugers, NY: Coventry Press, 1980. 182 pp.
Provides practical strategies, sample appraisal forms, and specific guidelines for faculty evaluation programs.

Sheppard, C. Stewart and Donald C. Carroll, eds. *Working in The Twenty-First Century.* New York: John Wiley, 1980. 235 pp.
What will the world of work be like in the year 2000? Will there be collective bargaining? Will good jobs be available in a service economy? Issac Asimov, Theodore Kheel, Suzanne Keller, are among the authors in this collection of essays who discusses these issues.

Wertheimer, Barbara Mayer, ed. *Labor Education for Women Workers.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981. 284 pp.
Original essays that fill the gap in curriculum needs of labor studies programs for women by twenty-nine labor educators in both academia and unions.

WORKSHOP I
Collective Bargaining Techniques in Higher Education

New York, NY
November 18-19, 1982

New York, NY
March 3-4, 1983

Los Angeles, CA
June 6-7, 1983

Designed to serve the experienced negotiator who often is found in the midst of crisis bargaining, as well as those new to collective bargaining, this workshop provides valuable insights into optional collective negotiation processes and contract clauses, how to minimize the possibility of impasse and achieve settlement, and implement a contract administration program. The mock negotiating sessions are based on actual college contracts and deal with both economic and non-economic topics. Hands-on topics will include developing proposals and counterproposals, "costing out" the contract, and negotiating strategies. Other topics to be discussed include mediation, fact-finding, interest arbitration, management rights, union security and agency shop.

WORKSHOP II
Grievance and Arbitration Procedures and Techniques in Higher Education

New York, NY
January 20-21, 1983

This workshop is designed to expose participants to a range of ideas, problems, and possible solutions for issues raised in grievance and arbitration. Those involved or soon to be involved in the grievance-arbitration processes will find this workshop providing valuable insights into optional grievance-arbitration machinery and contract clauses. Investigation of grievances, determination of whether to settle or go to arbitration, and preparation of a case for arbitration. Mock arbitration sessions, with experienced arbitrators serving as faculty members, have been built into each of the sessions. Role playing, case studies, and simulation game theory will be utilized. Hands-on topics will include settling within the grievance procedure, and the arbitrability of grievances. Other issues to be discussed include the powers, duties and authority of an arbitrator, the selection of an arbitrator, issue stipulation and remedy requests, "parol evidence," due process, past practice and argument, testimony, and evidence.

WORKSHOP III
Collective Bargaining Techniques for the Nursing Profession

New York, NY
December 7, 1982

Collective bargaining has invaded the health care professions. No where is this more evident than the nursing profession. Nurses are organizing in record numbers in both the private and public sectors, yet the legal framework under which they bargain is still in the emerging stages. This symposium is designed for leaders of employee organizations, hospital administrators charged with the collective bargaining responsibility as well as others desiring a broad understanding of the collective bargaining processes.
Topics covered will include unit determination, scope of bargaining, negotiations strategies, impasse procedures, and a legal review of the appropriate case law.

YESHIVA SYMPOSIUM

New York, NY
March 14, 1983

In the two and a half years that have elapsed since the United States Supreme Court ruled in *NLRB v. Yeshiva* that the entire faculty at Yeshiva University were managerial and, therefore, not entitled to bargain under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, nearly fifty private colleges and universities have exercised *Yeshiva*-like claims. Concomitant with this development has been the proliferation of such claims accompanied by rigorous *Yeshiva* defenses. This symposium will address post-*Yeshiva* NLRB rulings, as well as other related legal developments. The criteria used by the NLRB in its recent rulings in *Ithaca, Duquesne, Thiel, Bradford, Montefiore* and *Wordsworth* will be examined. This symposium is designed primarily for those in the private sector and updates the original *Yeshiva* symposium held at the Center in 1980.

11th ANNUAL CONFERENCE
New York, NY — April 25-26, 1983

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SYMPOSIUM
New York, NY — April 27, 1983

FACULTY

The faculty for each symposium and workshop will be selected from the following:

Joel M. Douglas
Director, NCSCBHEP
Arbitrator, Mediator

Frances K. Baraseh
Professor of English
Chairperson, Baruch Chapter
PSC/AFT

Joyce E. Barrett
Baruch College
PSC/CUNY Office of Legal Affairs

Maurice C. Benewitz
Arbitrator, Mediator
Former Dir., NCSCBHE

Arnold Cantor
Executive Director
PSC/AFT

Margaret Chandler
Professor, Columbia Univ.
Arbitrator, Mediator

William D. Crist
President, Cong. Faculty Assns.
NEA/AAUP/CSEA

Stephen L. Finner
Director, Northeast Region, AAUP

Daniel J. Julius
Director, Employee Relations
Calif. State Univ. & Colleges

Gregory Kramp
Manager, Labor Relations
Univ. of California, Los Angeles

Frederick Lane
Professor of Pub. Admin.
Baruch College, CUNY

Theodore H. Lang
Professor, Baruch College
Arbitrator, Mediator,
Former Dir. NCSCBHE

Aaron Levenstein
Professor Emeritus
Baruch College, CUNY
Former Assoc. Dir., NCSCBHEP

Ronald Levesque
Assoc. Executive Secretary
CAUT

Esther Liebert
Asst. to Pres., Fac. & Staff Affairs, Baruch College.
Arbitrator

Stewart Long
President
United Professors of California

Thomas Mannix
Director of Collective Bargaining Services, Univ. of Calif. System

Julius J. Manson
Former Dean and Professor Emeritus, Baruch College, CUNY; Arbitrator

Bernard Mintz
Exec. Asst. To President
Wm. Paterson College of NJ

William J. Neff
Manager, Labor Relations
Univ. of California, San Francisco

David Newton
Vice Chancellor
Long Island University

Robert Nielsen
Asst. to the President in Higher Education, AFT

Samuel Ranhand
Professor of Labor Relations—
Baruch College, Arbitrator

Jerry Veldof
Field Representative for Higher Educ.
New Jersey Education Association